5:Lienhardt E-4 (no date) 1954 FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

THE SHILLUK OF THE UPPER NILE

By GODFREY LIENHARDT

121 THIS essay is based primarily on literary sources,[1] which contain unusually full references to the religious and cosmological ideas of the Shilluk. In places, I have reinterpreted earlier writings on the Shilluk in the light of my own knowledge of the related Dinka, and of other 171 Nilotic studies. The concepts of these Nilotic peoples are alike in many ways, and the Shilluk and Dinka have for long been considered as related, from the point of view of anthropological theory, by the presence among them both of different forms of the institution of 'divine kingship', studied by Fraser and Seligman.[2] Upon this institution much of their interpretation of the universe and of their own place in it depend.

[771] 177 Lack of definition and dogma in their religion and cosmology makes it possible for Nilotic peoples to accept many different versions of their mythology and history, and also permits some syncretism of belief. I do not consider here speculations about the possible influences of ancient Egypt, the Fung, Islam, or the early monophysite Christianity of the Sudan, on Shilluk belief.[3] It is, in fact, remarkable that contact with foreign peoples and ideas, over a long period, should have left so little mark on Shilluk thought. Some of the stories which Hofmayr[4] attributes to Christian in- [114] fluence are widely known among other Nilotic peoples and elsewhere, in places farther removed from probable contact with Christianity. Lack of 772 formal definition of beliefs and notions about the universe also makes the 124 study of Shilluk cosmology necessarily a study based on inferences from [127] myths, hymns, and other texts, collected piecemeal from informants, none of whom can speak with any final authority. It is clear that Shilluk cosmology is not present to the mind of any one Shilluk as a single, orthodox system, [538] abstracted from the narrative flow and imaginative detail of myth. Even one man may tell slightly different versions of the same story,[5] for the telling is

[1] References throughout are to the Shilluk bibliography appended, the dates being the dates of the publications cited. Some of the sources contain many texts in the Shilluk language, and where these are translated into a language other than English, I have given an English version after examining the Shilluk text. I should like to thank all writers on the Shilluk, upon whose observations this summary and representation entirely depend. Their publications, however, are not all easily accessible, nor are they specifically concerned with the analysis of the Shilluk ideas here studied. This must be my excuse for writing about a people of great ethnological interest and importance, who have already been described in detail by writers who have known them well.

[2] J. G. Fraser, 1911. C. G. Seligman, 1911, C. G. and B. Z. Seligman, 1932.

[3] Discussion of Shilluk contacts with some of these will be found in W. Hofmayr, 1925, and D. Westermann, 1912. For general cultural and conceptual similarities between ancient Egypt and negro Africa, the reader may be referred to C. G. Seligman, 1934, and H. Frankfort, 1948, among others.

[4] 1925, pp. 195–6, the stories of a fall of man, and of a woman's bearing a god.

[5] D. S. Oyler, 1918 (i).

8:Howell E-4,5 (1937, 1948) 1953 FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

localized lineage within one settlement is certainly exogamous and there is also a bar to marriage into the maternal lineage. The clan, widely distributed in minor branches throughout Shilluk country, does not function as a corporate unit except at times of national festivals and then only in the sphere of ceremonial and ritual.

Marriage and Marriage Laws

As with the Nuer and Dinka, marriage among the Shilluk is achieved by the performance of recognized social procedures and the payment of bridewealth in the form of cattle, sheep, and goats. Nowadays, cash may be paid in addition to or in lieu of cattle, but not frequently and not in large sums.[1] It must be emphasized from the start that the Shilluk do not possess anything like the number of cattle owned by the Nuer and Dinka,[2] and for this reason alone the number of beasts paid as bridewealth is lower. Among the Nuer and Dinka the average ranges from fifteen to forty head of cattle according to the prevailing condition of the herds. Among the Shilluk the number is fixed at ten head, and although there have been times when few Shilluk were able to pay this number, it has been retained rigidly for several generations despite attempts by the Administration to reduce it. With sheep and goats, which are paid in addition but do not have the same significance, there is no such rigidity. The number of these seems to vary according to the attractions of the bride, though prevailing economic conditions doubtless play their part.

There is much to be found on the subject of marriage in the writings of Hofmayr, Westermann, and Seligman,[3] though many statements are misleading. This summary account of Shilluk marriage laws is based largely on the writings, both published and unpublished, of M. E. C. Pumphrey[4] who not only took into account previous literature but, as an administrator in Shilluk country for several years, had better opportunities to investigate the legal aspect of the subject. These are supplemented by my own direct observations.[5]

The Social Processes and Legality of Marriage

Pumphrey says:

> The marriage tie creates an obligation to pay cattle, but it is not created by or dependent upon such payment. To render a union a marriage only two things are essential. First there must be no positive barrier (such as known consanguinity between the parties . . .) and secondly there must be an offer and an acceptance. The offer and acceptance are symbolised by the man offering the woman's *gol*[6] a sheep (*dyel dhok*). Acceptance of this sheep signifies acceptance of the suitor. The marriage is then complete.[7]

This transaction, which is limited to the immediate family of the parties to the marriage, is followed by *tieng mogho* (the brewing of beer) and a wedding dance (*mogho thiek*) to which many persons are invited and which therefore serves to make the union widely known. It is not, however, strictly correct to say that the marriage is,

[1] The tendency to use cash in lieu of cattle is apparently increasing.

[2] Ratio of human to cattle population: Shilluk 1:0·25; Nuer 1:2·3 (highest recorded).

[3] See Bibliography of the Shilluk, given in a previous article (*Africa*, xxii. 2).

[4] Pumphrey, 'The Shilluk Tribe', *S.N.R.*, vol. xxiv, 1941.

[5] Based on field work carried out in 1937 and on an investigation and analysis of the marriages of one Shilluk lineage carried out in 1948. The results are to be published later.

[6] Family group and legal guardians.

[7] Pumphrey, op. cit., p. 25.

9:Howell E-5 (1937-1950) 1952 FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

some of the beasts are sacrificed during the ceremonies and others are added to their personal herds. One must, therefore, beg the question whether those portions alleged to be the right of the *reth* were ritual fees of this nature rather than 'fines' as is so frequently stated. It is a question of interpretation, and I suggest that even though repressive action and the exaction of 'fines' may have occurred, with the backing of foreign Governments, during the latter half of the last century and the early years of the present Administration, the payments were ritual in origin and concerned the *reth*'s ritual function in society. The use of the word 'fine' appears to me to be inaccurate.

Ritual of Purification for Homicide

As among other Nilotic peoples, a Shilluk who has killed another must perform certain rites to cleanse him from impurity which might otherwise affect his kinsmen. This process involves, first, the letting of blood, which is carried out by a magical expert (*ajwogo*)[1] who makes a small incision on his right shoulder with a spear. This is known as *tai dhuni*. Secondly, a small sacrifice is made (usually a sheep), the object of which is to remove the curse of the dead man's spirit. As among the Nuer and Dinka, the killer is not expected to eat or drink until this ritual has been performed.

Accidental Killing

Accidental killing (*agwony*) is apparently not regarded as a serious offence among the Shilluk, especially if the two parties are connected by kinship or by close association in one territory. Hofmayr says: 'Accidental killing requires only the sacrifice of an ox at a peace ceremony and no more.'[2] District records indicate that two head of cattle sometimes were paid. At the Shilluk Chiefs' Council in 1934 it is recorded that 'the Council do not know whether there is a definite law on this subject or not. The *reth* says that years ago it was two head of cattle, one to the relatives of the dead man, one to the *reth*. He himself suggests two head of cattle to go to the deceased's family. This is confirmed as law.' I do not think that any such fixed indemnity existed in the past, but that intention was recognized and accident accepted in mitigation of the offence. At any rate the indignation of the deceased's kinsmen would not be so acute, and they would be prepared to accept an indemnity less than that normally demanded for intentional homicide.

Bodily Injuries not causing Death

On the subject of bodily injuries less than death, the evidence is even less reliable than on homicide. It is evident that such injuries require the payment of compensation if retaliatory action is not to follow. At the same time it is perhaps surprising that among the Shilluk, unlike the Nuer and Dinka, there are no recognized injuries for which compensation is given on a definite scale. We hear that 'for injury' an immediate payment of one bull must be made as a guarantee of good faith. Subsequent settlement is made on a scale regulated by the severity of the ultimate damage and rising, in the case of blinding, to the same rate as for death. Apart from the problem of the *reth*'s intervention in matters of this sort, it may be assumed, in the absence of

amount to eight cattle out of a total of forty.

[1] *Ajwogo*: Magical expert or specialist. These persons are not comparable to the Nuer functionaries, such as the *kuar kuar*, but to the possessors of spirits (*gwan kwoth*). *Ajwogo* is a derivative of *Juok*, meaning God in Shilluk.

[2] Op. cit.

29:Dempsey M-5 (1940-1954) 1955
FJ23 Shilluk FJ23

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I AM indebted to the Superior General of the Verona Missionary Fathers for permission to use the material on which Chapter X is based, and to Sister Columba Ward for her translation of this material from the Italian original; to the Editor of *The Sudan Notes and Records*; and to Messrs. W. P. G. Thomson and P. P. Howell for much of the description of Chapter VI.

Use has also been made in various chapters, for information on and confirmation of the matter contained therein, of *Pagan Tribes of the Nilotic Sudan* by G. C. Seligman, *A Survey of the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan* by K. D. D. Henderson, *The Egyptian Sudan; Its Loss and Recovery* by Alford and Swords.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the Very Rev. F. Spakauskas, the Rev. J. Fitzsimons and the Rev. Mother G. Colognesi of the Malakal Prefecture, Upper Nile Province, and to the Very Rev. J. P. Kennelly of St Joseph's College, Freshford, Co. Kilkenny, Ireland, who supplied the photographs; to the Rev. W. Hallam of the Malakal Prefecture and the Rev. A. Foreman of St Josef's Missiehuis, Roosendaal, Holland, for their valued help and advice in the writing of the book; and to the Rev. B. J. Traynor, M.A., of Mill Hill, London, and Mr. Brian Carey of Burn Hall, Durham, for their assistance in preparing the manuscript for the press.

Catholic Mission, Lul,
Upper Nile Province,
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.

J. DEMPSEY

[p vi is blank]